

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 7, 13, 19, 25-26, 28, 30 and 32 are cancelled. Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-18, 20-24, 27, 29 and 31 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for Examiner's reconsideration.

Claim 2 has been amended solely to have the claim better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is submitted with the present Amendment.

In the Office Action, the following was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): (1) claims 1-2, 8, 14, 19, 29, and 31 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hind (U.S. Patent No. 6,635,088) in view of Davison (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,601) and Porter (U.S. Patent No. 6,163,811); (2) claims 3-4, 9-10, and 15-16 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hind in view of Davison and Porter and in further view of Examiner's Official Notice; (3) claims 5-6, 11-12, and 17-18 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hind in view of Davison and Porter as applied to claims 1, 8, and 14 and further in view of Bodin (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,223); (4) claims 20 and 33 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hind in view of Davison; (5) claims 21 and 22 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hind in view of Davison and further in view of Examiner's Official Notice; and (6) claims 23-24 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hind in view of Davison and in further view of Bodin. Applicant submits that the remaining claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

For example, amended claim 1 is directed to a processor implemented method of forming unidirectional

distribution content that includes a data module, and the method includes:

unidirectionally distributing the content whereby the plurality of character strings is not distributed[.] (Emphasis added.)

The relied-on sections of Hind do not disclose or suggest unidirectionally distributing the content and do not disclose or suggest that the plurality of character strings is not distributed.

Rather, Hind requires that a file include an entity declaration that relates each of the replaced strings to the entity that replaced it, and thus the file contains each of the replaced strings. Hind indicates that such "entity declarations must appear at the beginning of the file" (emphasis added) because Hind teaches using the XML parser to later replace each entity reference with its associated string. (See, e.g., Fig.3B, col.8 l.60 - col.9 l.1, col.9 ll.14-38, and col.10 ll.5-15.) As a result, the file must include at least one occurrence of each of the replaced strings.

Claim 1, by contrast, calls for unidirectionally distributing the content. The replaced plurality of character strings is not needed at the receiving end so that there is no need to distribute the replaced plurality of character strings. Hence, the plurality of character strings is not distributed. Hind neither discloses nor suggests these limitations.

Moreover, neither the relied-on sections of Davison, the relied-on sections of Porter, nor the relied-on sections of Bodin addresses the above-described deficiencies of Hind.

Applicant also maintains that Hind teaches away from combining relied-on sections of Hind with the relied-on sections of Davison for the reasons set out in the January 3, 2007 Amendment.

It follows that claim 1 is patentably distinct and

unobvious over the cited references. Further, independent claims 8, 14 and 20 each include limitations similar to those recited in the above excerpt of claim 1 and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

Additionally, claims 2-6, and 27 depend from claim 1, claims 9-12 and 29 depend from claim 8, claims 15-18 and 31 depend from claim 14, and claims 21-24 and 33 depend from claim 20. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

Application No.: 09/786,878

Docket No.: SONYSU 3.3-120

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: April 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

755949_1.DOC